



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/646,416	08/21/2003	Ophir Rachman	6599P011	9242
8791	7590	10/31/2007	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040			WANG, RONGFA PHILIP	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2191				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/31/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/646,416	RACHMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Philip Wang	2191

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/15/2007.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11,13-17,22-30 and 33 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 18,31 and 32 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11,13-17,22-30 and 33 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

Detail Action

1. This office action is in response to RCE filed on 8/15/2007.
2. Per Applicant's request, claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 18, 22, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33 have been amended.
3. The 35 U.S.C §112 first paragraph rejections of claims 1-7, 10, 14-18, and 22-33 have been withdrawn in view of the Applicant's amendment to the claims.
4. Claims 1-11, 13-17, and 22-30, 33 are pending.

Priority

5. The priority date considered for this application is 5/16/2003.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 18, 31 and 32 are allowable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 14-17, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 14 and its depend claims, recites the limitation of "creating a dummy installation image that includes a plurality of dummy files representing the plurality of files, based on said file types". It is not what file type(s) will create dummy files. The language as presented can be interpreted to create dummy files based on any file type. The language as presented does not clearly state what file type(s) will satisfy the condition for creating a dummy file(s). The examiner suggests the applicant amend the claims to particularly clarify what file types will create dummy files.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1, 8, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yeung et al. (US PGPub. No. 2003/0078959).

As per claim 1,

Yeung et al. disclose

Art Unit: 2191

- converting an installation program which is in a form not formatted for streaming into a streamable installation program which is in a form formatted for streaming, the installation program for installing a software application on a computer system; and streaming the streamable installation program to a target processing system over a network to cause the installation program to configure the target processing system for execution of the software application ([0007], for example, lines 14-17, "...the installation packages...and utilized them to install the software...", [0036], for example, lines 32-33, "These files are transmitted in a streaming manner, rather than on a file-by-file basis...", where Yeung et al. discloses streaming installation program over a network to install software to a target system. Since the installation program is capable of streaming, there exist a conversion of the installation program in a form not formatted for streaming into a form formatted for streaming.).

As per claim 8,

Yeung et al. disclose

- downloading, to a client over a network, only portions of an installation program, the installation program for use to install a software application on a computer system, wherein the software application resides on a server; using only said downloaded portions of the installation program on the client to configure the client to execute the software application, including identifying portions of the software application that are to be download to the client; downloading only said portions of the software application from the server to the client; and executing the software application on the client using only said portions of the software application downloaded to the client ([0007], for example, lines 14-17, "...the installation packages...and utilized them to install the software...", [0036], for example, lines 32-36, "These files are transmitted in a streaming manner, rather than on a file-by-file basis...only those files which needs to be updated" where Yeung et al. discloses streaming installation program over a network to install software to a target system. Yeung et al. further disclose portion of the files can be downloaded for installation.).

As per claim 22,

Yeung et al. disclose

- means for packaging an installation program which is in a standardized installation format which is not formatted for streaming in a form that facilitates streaming of the installation program to a target processing system, the installation program for use in installing a software application; and means for streaming the installation program to the target processing system to cause the target processing system to be configured to execute the software application ([0007], for example, lines 14-17, "...the installation packages...and utilized them to install the software...", [0036], for example, lines 32-33, "These files are transmitted in a streaming manner, rather than on a file-by-file basis...", where Yeung et al. discloses streaming installation program over a network to install software to a target system. Since the installation program is capable of streaming, there exist a conversion of the installation program in a form not formatted for streaming into a form formatted for streaming.).

As per claim 25.

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Further Yeung et al. disclose

Art Unit: 2191

- wherein the installation format is a standardized installation format ([0007], line 5, "...MSI packages...").

As per claim 26,

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated;

Further Yeung et al. disclose

- wherein the standardized installation format is MSI format ([0007], line 5, "...MSI packages...").

As per claim 27,

The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. disclose

- prior to said downloading only portions of the installation program to the client, converting the installation program from a standardized installation format which is not formatted for streaming into a streamable installation program which is configured for software streaming ([0007], for example, lines 14-17, "...the installation packages...and utilized them to install the software...", [0036], for example, lines 32-36, "These files are transmitted in a streaming manner, rather than on a file-by-file basis...only those files which needs to be updated" where Yeung et al. discloses streaming installation

Art Unit: 2191

program over a network to install software to a target system. Yeung et al. further disclose portion of the files can be downloaded for installation.).

As per claim 28,

The rejection of claim 27 is incorporated;

- Yeung et al. disclose wherein the standardized installation format is MSI format ([0007], line 5, "...MSI packages...").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-17, 23, 24, 29, 30, 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yeung et al. (US PGPub. No. 2003/0078959) in view of Holler et al. (PGPub. No. 2003/0004882).

As per claim 2,

the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. does not specifically disclose the claimed limitation

However, Holler et al. disclose wherein said streaming the installation program to the target processing system comprises

- using the installation program in a streaming mode to create user-specific information on the target processing system, the user-specific information for subsequent use by the software application when the software application is executed on the target processing system in the streaming mode ([0545], "1. The streamed application installation procedure..."; [0548], "c. Client does not have to wait for the entire application to be downloaded..."; [0157]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to include to the claimed limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. does not specifically disclose the claimed limitation,

However, Holler et al. disclose wherein said streaming the installation program to a target processing system over a network to cause the installation program to configure the target processing system for execution of the software application comprises

- causing the target system to be configured for streaming the software application ([0157], for example, line 9-10, "...updates...the Registry..." updating the Registry is an example of configuring the target system.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to include to the claimed limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. does not specifically disclose the claimed limitation,

However, Holler et al. disclose

- streaming the software application from a host processing system to the target processing system over the network ([0080], line 5-6, "...the application is converted into a form suitable for streaming over the network.").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to include to the claimed limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. does not specifically disclose the claimed limitation,

However, Holler et al. disclose said streaming the installation program comprises:

- identifying portions of the installation program that need to be downloaded to the target processing system; downloading the portions of the installation program to the target processing system; and executing the installation program on the target processing system using only said portions([0086], "The Stream Enabled Application Install Block is used to install a SAS-based application on a client system...The Stream Enabled Application Install Block is the first set of data to be streamed from the server to the client...the information needed by the client to prepare for the streaming and execution of the application"; [0157]);.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to include to the claimed limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. does not specifically disclose the claimed limitation,

However, Holler et al. disclose,

- prior to streaming the installation program, packaging the installation program into a form which facilitates streaming of the installation program ([0080], line 5-6, "...the application is converted into a form suitable for streaming over the network."); [0086], "The Stream Enabled Application Install Block is used to install a SAS-based application on a client system...The Stream Enabled Application Install Block is the first set of data to be streamed from the server to the client...");

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of

Yeung et al. to include to the claimed limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated;

Yeung et al. does not specifically disclose the claimed limitation.

However, Holler et al. disclose the installation program comprises

- a dummy installation package ([0605], "...the set of pages critical for the initial invocation and packages them as part of the AIB..), application information ([0434], "...includes versioning information, application identification...) and a database, the database containing the software application and indicating a segmenting of the software application (See Fig. 31, [0428]-[0567]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to include to the claimed limitation. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 9, the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated; further Holler et al. disclose it recites the same limitation as claim 7 and is rejected for the same reason set forth for the rejection of claim 7.

As per claim 10,

Yeung et al. disclose

- converting an installation program which is in a standardized installation format that is not formatted for streaming into a form that enables streaming of the installation program to a target processing system, the installation program for use in installing a software application; and streaming the installation program to the target processing system ([0007], for example, lines 14-17, "...the installation packages...and utilized them to install the software...", [0036], for example, lines 32-33, "These files are transmitted in a streaming manner, rather than on a file-by-file basis...", where Yeung et al. discloses streaming installation program over a network to install software to a target system. Since the installation program is capable of streaming, there exist a conversion of the installation program in a

form not formatted for streaming into a form formatted for streaming.)

Yeung et al. do not specifically disclose

- to cause the target processing system to be configured for streaming execution of the software application.

However, Holler et al. disclose

- to cause the target processing system to be configured for streaming execution of the software application ([0016], "...enables...efficiently stream application programs...").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to include to cause the target processing system to be configured for streaming execution of the software application. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 11,

the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated; further Holler et al. disclose

- said streaming the installation program to the target processing system comprises using the installation program in a streaming mode to create user-specific information on the target processing system, the user-specific information for subsequent use by the software application when

the software application is executed on the target processing system in the streaming mode ([0545], "1. The streamed application installation procedure..."; [0548], "c. Client does not have to wait for the entire application to be downloaded..."; [0157]).

As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated; further Holler et al. disclose

- it recites the same limitation as claim 7 and is rejected for the same reason set forth for the rejection of claim 7.

As per claim 14,

Yeung et al. disclose

- input an installation package for use in installing a software application on a target system, the installation package being in a form not formatted for streaming, the -installation package including a plurality of files ([0007], for example, lines 14-17, "...the installation packages...and utilized them to install the software...", [0036], for example, lines 32-33, "These files are transmitted in a streaming manner, rather than on a

file-by-file basis...", where Yeung et al. discloses streaming installation program over a network to install software to a target system. Since the installation program is capable of streaming, there exist a conversion of the installation program in a form not formatted for streaming into a form formatted for streaming.).

Yeung et al. do not specifically disclose

- identifying all of the plurality of files in the installation package;
- classifying each of the plurality of files according to file type;
- creating a dummy installation image that includes a plurality of dummy files representing the plurality of files, based on said file types; and
- creating the streaming installation package from the dummy installation image,
- said streaming installation package being in a form that can be executed on a target system in a streaming mode.

However, Holler et al. disclose

- classifying each of the plurality of files according to file type; creating a dummy installation package that includes a plurality of dummy files representing the plurality of files, based on said file types ([0173], "non-application-specific files..."; [0431], for example, line 6-7, "The information includes the total byte

size and an index table...”, further, lines 19-22, “...any application-specific installation not covered by the default streamed application...”); and

- creating the streaming installation package from the dummy installation package([0605], “...the set of pages critical for the initial invocation and packages them as part of the AIB... See Fig. 31, [0428]-[0567]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Holler et al. into the teachings of Yeung et al. to the above disclosed limitation supported by Holler et al. The modification would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to want to provide optimize performance for the delivery and management of streaming applications as suggested by Holler et al. (see [0003]).

As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated; further Holler et al. disclose

- the non-streaming installation package conforms to an installation standard ([0283], last two lines, “On Windows 2000, for example, the Installer Service is called “msi.exe.”).

As per claim 16, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated; further Holler et al. disclose

- the streaming installation package further includes application information and a database, wherein the database contains the software application and indicates a segmenting of the application([0434], "...includes versioning information, application identification...");
(See Fig. 31, [0428]-[0567]).

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated; further Holler et al. disclose

- the streaming installation package is configured to be streamed to a target system to configure the target system for execution of a software application in a streaming mode ([0545], "1. The streamed application installation procedure..."; [0548], "c. Client does not have to wait for the entire application to be downloaded..."; [0157]).

As per claim 23, the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, it recites the same limitation as in claim 2 and is rejected for the same reason set forth for the rejection of claim 2.

As per claim 24, the rejection of claim 23 is incorporated; it recites the same limitation as in claim 3 and is rejected for the same reason set forth for the rejection of claim 3.

As per claim 29.

The rejection of claim 14 is incorporated;

Further Yeung et al. disclose

- wherein the installation format is a standardized installation format ([0007], line 5, "...MSI packages...").

As per claim 30,

The rejection of claim 29 is incorporated;

Further Yeung et al. disclose

- wherein the standardized installation format is MSI format ([0007], line 5, "...MSI packages...").

As per claim 33,

The rejection of claim 22 is incorporated;

Further Yeung et al. disclose

- wherein the standardized installation format is MSI format ([0007], line 5, "...MSI packages...").

Response to Arguments

In the remark,


10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Wang whose telephone number is 571-272-5934. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri 8:00AM - 4:00PM. Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached on 571-272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WEI ZHEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER